

ANSWERS —TO— QUESTIONS CONCERNING HOMŒOPATHY.

BY W. B. MORGAN, A. M., M. D., ST. LOUIS.

1. What is Homœopathy?

The medical system in which the sick are treated by drugs which, when given to the healthy, produce symptoms similar to those for which they are given in disease. Its basis is a fixed law of nature, instead of the whimsical and ever-changing medical fashions strangely called "regular" medicine.

2. Is disease curable in such a manner?

The experience of two generations of observers, comprising thousands of physicians, has established it beyond a doubt. That allopathic physicians deny it proves nothing to the contrary. Most of them either from prejudice or considerations of policy have not investigated the subject, so their testimony is simply that of those who do not know. The pioneers of Homœopathy were allopaths who had investigated. A leading British medical society appointed a committee of five of its members to investigate and expose the "humbug," Homœopathy. Two members of the committee became converted and the other three never reported. Constantine Hering, a prominent light in Berlin medical circles, was similarly appointed to investigate and controvert Homœopathy, with the result that he became the Father of Homœopathy in this country.

3. If diseases are curable by such a method, how do its practical results compare with those of the old school?

Statistics cannot be obtained from physicians in private practice, but the records of hospitals and other public institutions furnish them, and they show, not in single instances but in dozens, unmistakable advantage from homœopathic treatment. The State of Michigan has two insane asylums, one under allopathic and the other under homœopathic management. The one in charge of homœopaths reports a percentage of cures three times as great as the other. Of the two penitentiaries in Illinois the one having homœopathic medical treatment reports the loss of time on account of sickness of prisoners as only about two-thirds that in the other. Institutions in New York, Colorado and other parts of the country have made similar showings, till those who will give heed to the facts cannot but be convinced that, when compared to the results from the so-called "regular" treatment, homœopathy materially lessens mortality, shortens sickness and reduces its expense.

4. If that is so, why are not all public institutions put in homœopathic charge?

Such things go according to political influence. The welfare of the sick or of the public funds count as nothing against it.

5. Is Homœopathy able to cope with serious diseases, or is it, as some say, only applicable to slight ailments of children and delicate women?

Its most unmistakable triumphs have been made in the treatment of cholera and yellow fever. The last time cholera visited this country the mortality of those receiving homœopathic treatment was only one-half that of others having the disease. In the yellow fever epidemic of 1878, the general mortality in New Orleans, where records were accurately kept, was 19 per cent, while that of persons receiving homœopathic treatment was only 6 per cent, less than one-third as great. The records in this instance have been sifted until it is certain there was no error or misrepresentation in the reports made.

6. If Homœopathy is so much superior, why do homœopathic physicians sometimes resort to old school treatment?

This query results from misapprehension as to the sphere of Homœopathy. No one would expect a physician of any school to attempt to set a broken bone with a dose of medicine, or to treat a case of arsenic poisoning by any method except an emetic followed by a chemical antidote. Either case is manifestly not in the field of Homœopathy, and in the general practice of medicine there are other conditions occasionally presenting in which it is required to give crude drugs for their chemical, mechanical or even toxic effects. Of the 10,000 homœopathic physicians in the United States, nearly all do so; only a few enthusiasts, who, in speaking represent themselves, only not the homœopathic profession, profess to do otherwise. The mass of homœopaths believe in the use of homœopathy within its proper sphere, not in its abuse by attempting to apply it to what it is not adapted. Its range of application as established by experience covers, perhaps, nine-tenths of the cases of sickness. Because the other tenth of the cases are not treated homœopathically does not prove Homœopathy a humbug nor that its practitioners are inconsistent in not practicing as somebody else may have proposed to do.

7. Are not Homœopathic physicians generally less thoroughly educated than those of the old school?

The prestige of old institutions has given some color to this idea, but the probabilities are that the converse is true. Homœopathy has been most popular in the most cultivated communities; it is the medical practice of thinking people and the ranks of its practitioners have been mainly recruited from them. The fossils of the medical profession, those who have only two or three prescriptions that serve on all occasions, must be looked for outside the homœopathic school. The homœopathic colleges conform to the same standard of legal requirements that those of the old school do. According to the report of the bureau of education the medical college having the highest standard of requirements of any in the United States is homœopathic (Boston University Medical School). Most of the early homœopaths and some of the later ones were educated in the old school.

8. How can such small doses of medicine as are usually given do any good? It does not seem reasonable.

No one knows how it is. The matter is not one to be reasoned about. Reasoning processes never taught anybody that two grains of arsenic would kill a man, but *trial* proved it, as it has the efficacy of properly selected small doses of medicine. Large doses of homœopathic drug gravate disease.

9. What is the comparative cost of homoeopathic treatment ?

“ The best is the cheapest ” at any price, but in this matter the best costs the least money. Homoeopathic treatment saves drug bills and shortens sickness. Those receiving it recover more completely and naturally, so that, other things being equal, they are less liable to be sick again.

10. If all these things are so, why has not Homoeopathy been universally accepted ?

History shows that any discovery requiring a complete overthrow of the established traditions and beliefs of the people has required considerable time to overcome opposition and win general recognition. In a little over fifty years Homoeopathy has been adopted by eight or ten millions of people in this country, and it has compelled the old school to abandon the severe methods it had followed indefinitely before the advent of Homoeopathy. Regular doctors have not only abandoned their old methods but are beginning to make with surprising frequency original (?) discoveries of homoeopathic prescriptions. Lauder Brunton a leading English authority, recently published a book in which 65 per cent of the treatment recommended was homoeopathic. As he did not say that he had adopted it from homoeopathic writings he has not been excommunicated. His case serves to show the attitude of the old school toward homoeopathy at the present time. A regular physician may be a homoeopath and advocate homoeopathic practice as much as he chooses, if he only does not call it homoeopathic. Homoeopathic physicians believe their practice different enough from that of the average of “regulars” to require a distinctive name and they propose to keep it, letting the public decide who are imposters.

